



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An international Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_OR_10268
Title of the Manuscript:	The etiology and antibiogram of bacterial causes of conjunctivitis among patients attending the eye clinic at Rugarama Hospital in South Western Uganda
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This article describes histological and morphological findings of human conjunctival bacterial sensitivities toward various antibiotics treatment. While the clinical observations in this report could be of interest to ophthalmology readership, the following critiques and recommendations could improve the manuscript: A. General Comments and recommendations: B. The title of the manuscript does not reflect the content of text--as little discussion on the causes of various bacterial infections and tissues susceptibility are provided in the text. C. Repetitions on statements throughout the manuscript should be minimized. D. Much of the conclusion should be moved to introduction as what the issues are. E. Discussion should mainly focus on analyses of data and comparison with	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	similarly published information and what are characteristic features of the manuscript that is worth publishing. B. Critiques: 1. Introduction: A brief introduction to the function of conjunctiva that would describe the normal composition of conjunctival flora and what is clinically known when tissue reacts toward the bacterial infections that the authors are using for determination of sensitivities toward treatments. Any knowledge about frequency of patients visit to eye or other medical clinics with an infection; any known observation on associations between other potential tissue sites manifested by the same microorganism infections would be helpful. 2. Methodology --details of the methods, incubation period and application of drugs need to be explained for: a. 'Upon growth, organisms were identified using biochemical techniques.'	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	What techniques were used? Include brief methodology and related citations. The basis for biochemical techniques that are currently used for detection of different infective organisms and their findings by others should be briefly discussed both in the introduction and methodology sections, any modifications of the methods that authors may have applied should be identified. b. 'Sensitivity was performed using the Kirby Bauer technique and interpreted according to CLSI guidelines' – brief description needed so the article would be understood on its own using appropriate citations. c. Quality control.. "All procedures followed the established standard operating procedures and	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	standard organisms” What are standard operating or organisms procedures--a brief explanantion could help the reader using citation. d. What is the duration between taking swap and culturing the samples? 3. Results: The treatment with anti-bacterial agents?—figures do not clearly reflect bacterial sensitivity in culture or eye and/or both need better labeling. 4. Discussion: Is there anything known about the clinical features of infections and/or treatment used for <i>S. aureus</i> and gonerrea in conjunctiva vs other target tissues? The authors provided a few citations but no details for comparison of other similar work. a. Lines 75-87--‘Of the 196 participants samples, 87 (44.39%) were found to be positive for bacterial	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conjunctivitis. A total of 13 out of 87 patient samples were <i>Neisseria gonorrhoeae</i> and 74 were <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> bacteria....This variation could be due to the fact that most of the patients were adults other than young children..... However the prevalence found in this study was higher than that in some other countries... in the Netherlands, the prevalence of a positive bacterial culture in...' Why data on few children were included? And what would have been if statistics were done without inclusion of children—the authors should be able to readily do the statistics. b. Lines 93-95-- ' This may have been due to the fact that <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> has the ability to colonise various body parts hence is a very	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	common microorganism as seen in the various studies...' In this author's concept or is there any supportive reference. c. Lines 128-136 –it would be helpful to explain the effect of various antibiotics e.g., gentamicine, tetracycline, ciprofloxin and chloramphenicol on S. aureous- or N. gonorrhoeae- infected eyes, compared with those of penicillin/oxacillin treatment, e.g., composition of antibiotics, differences in the drgrees of penetration of drugs into tissue site, etc. C. Minor points-typos- a. Material and Methods---'Regional Referral Hospital where it was and cultured on blood agar, and MacConkey agar and incubated for 24-48 hours.' b. . 'Permission to conduct the study the	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	study was also'—correct double words Results- Demographic data -- 'This study included 196 participants 43 (21.94%) were <u>from</u> women and 153 (78.06%) were <u>from</u> men whose age ranged between 1 year and 80 years old and were categorized into 553 age group.' Delete words—'from'	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahin Khatami
Department, University & Country	Cellular/Molecular Biologist, Immunologist Inflammation, Aging and Cancer, National Cancer Institute (ret), The national Institutes of Health, Bethesda